

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending. Claims 1, 7 and 13 are amended by way of the present amendment to additionally recite “said destination information indicating a destination without identifying an address of the destination.” Support for such additional recitation is found in the present specification at page 15, line 6 through page 16, line 16, for example. Applicants therefore submit that no new matter is introduced.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 13 were rejected as anticipated by Perkins (“Mobile IP”, Charles E. Perkins, IEEE Communications Magazine, May 1997, pages 84-99). Claims 3-6 were rejected as unpatentable over Perkins in view of Ayoub et al. (WO 99/33305, herein “Ayoub”). However, Claims 9-12 were indicated as allowed. Applicants appreciatively acknowledge the identification of allowable subject matter.

Addressing the rejection based on Perkins, that rejection is traversed by the present amendment.

Independent Claim 1 is directed to a packet signal for use in a communication network, and now amended to additionally recite that *said destination information indicating a destination without identifying an address of the destination*. Accordingly, the present invention as recited in amended Claim 1 uses destination information that indicates a destination by use of a description of a state of a mobile terminal. The state of a mobile terminal is a state of movement or a state of environment in which the mobile terminal is placed. Such destination information indicates a destination *without identifying an address of the destination*.

In a non-limiting example, the state of a mobile terminal includes a speed of movement, temperature and humidity. The packet that identifies a destination by such state

of a mobile terminal is delivered to one or more mobile terminals having a state that matches with the indicated state of a mobile terminal. Thus, the packet is delivered to one or more destinations without indicating the address of these destinations. As a result, significant advantages are obtained in terms of reduction in channel congestion and channel load.

Perkins teaches, when a mobile node moves away from its home network, that it obtains a care-of-address with a foreign network for instance by listening for agent advertisements; and that, while away from home, the mobile node registers each new care-of address with its home agent, possibly by way of a foreign agent.¹ Thus, what Perkins teaches is the use of the care-of-address for the mobile terminal to indicate whether the mobile terminal is located in the foreign network different from the home network.

Accordingly, in such configuration in Perkins, when IP header information indicating a care-of-address as its destination is attached to the mobile node, an original header and payload is put into a capsule thereby shielding the original header information from routers along the way. In this regard, the IP header information indicates its destination by the care-of-address; and the original header information indicates its destination by the address of the destination. Thus, nowhere does Perkins teach or suggest *the destination information indicating a destination without identifying an address of the destination*, as recited in amended Claim 1.

Therefore, amended independent Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Perkins. Applicants therefore respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Although of different statutory class, amended independent Claims 7 and 13 are also considered patentably distinguishable over Perkins for substantially the same reasons as discussed above with regard to amended Claim 1.

¹ See the section "Protocol Overview" in Perkins at page 86, the left column.

Claims 2-6 and 8 are considered allowable at least for the reasons advanced for amended Claims 1 and 7 from which they depend, respectively.

With regard to another cited reference of Ayoub in the outstanding Office Action, Applicants wish to note that Ayoub does not teach or suggest the above discussed additional feature that the destination information indicating a destination without identifying an address of the destination, as recited in amended Claims 1, 7 and 13.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-8 and 13, as amended, patentably defines over the asserted prior art. With the indication that Claims 9-12 are allowed, the present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
BDL/HY

I:\ATTY\HY\20s\201220\201220US-AM3.DOC